

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

COMMONWEALTH OF
PENNSYLVANIA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ANTONELLO BOLDRINI,

Defendant.

No. 3:23-CV-1921

(Chief Judge Brann)

(Magistrate Judge Carlson)

ORDER

SEPTEMBER 12, 2024

Petitioner Antonello Boldrini, named as a Defendant in several criminal cases, purported to remove those cases to this Court on November 3, 2023, and it was jointly assigned to the undersigned and to a magistrate judge. Upon designation, a magistrate judge may “conduct hearings, including evidentiary hearings, and . . . submit to a judge of the court proposed findings of fact and recommendations.”¹ Once filed, this report and recommendation is disseminated to the parties in the case who then have the opportunity to file written objections.²

On August 20, 2024 Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson, to whom this matter is jointly assigned, issued a thorough report and recommendation recommending

¹ 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(B).

² 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1).

that this matter be summarily remanded to the Luzerne County, Pennsylvania Court of Common Pleas.

No objections to the report and recommendation have been filed. Where no objection is made to a report and recommendation, this Court will review the recommendation only for clear error.³ Regardless of whether timely objections are made, district courts may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in part—the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.⁴

Because the Court writes solely for the parties, it will not restate the facts, but will instead adopt the recitation of facts as set forth by the magistrate judge. The Court has conducted a de novo review here and found no error.

AND NOW, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Magistrate Judge Carlson’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 4) is **ADOPTED** in full; and
2. This Case is **REMANDED** to the Luzerne County, Pennsylvania Court of Common Pleas.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Matthew W. Brann

Matthew W. Brann

Chief United States District Judge

³ Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987) (explaining that court should in some manner review recommendations regardless of whether objections were filed).

⁴ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.